

11

REMARKS

Claims 1-19, 29 and 31 are pending in the Application. In the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment that the Examiner issued on July 15, 2005, the Examiner allowed claims 18-19, objected to claims 5 and 7-9 as being dependent on a rejected base claim (but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim) and rejected claims 1-4, 6, 10-17, 29 and 31.

While Applicants continue to believe that the proviso that Applicants added to claim 1 in their previous Amendment of April 27, 2005 makes the claim allowable over the rejection in view of *In re Johnson et al.*, 558 F.2d 1008 (CCPA 1977); 194 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 184 (as Applicants argued in their Amendment of April 27, 2005), Applicants are now canceling claims 1-4 and amending claim 5 to independent form as required by the Examiner. The amendment is being done strictly with a view to advance the prosecution and not to be construed as an admission of non-patentability of the claim scope involved. Applicants intend to file divisional application(s) on the cancelled scope as well as any restricted claims.

Claim 5, as stated earlier, is now in independent form including the limitations of claims 1 and 2 from where it previously received dependency. Additionally, claims 7, 9-10, 12-17, 29 and 31 which previously depended from claim 1 or 2 is now amended to depend from claim 5. Claims 1-4 and 6 are now cancelled; claims 20-28 and 30 were cancelled earlier.

There being no other rejection pending, Applicants believe that the claims, as amended, are in allowable condition and such an action is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

August 1, 2005
Schering-Plough Corporation
2000 Galloping Hill Road
Patent Department, K-6-1, 1990
Kenilworth, NJ 07033
Tel: (908) 298-5068
Fax: (908) 298-5388

Respectfully submitted,



Dr. Palaiyur S. Kalyanaraman
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 34,634